

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed December 13, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 19, 21 through 23 and 25 through 34 are currently pending in the application. Claims 19, 21 through 23, 25, 27, and 29 through 34 stand rejected. Claims 26 and 28 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicant has cancelled claims 26, 28 and 32 and amended claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as proposed to be amended herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Japanese Patent No. 63-179537 to Yasuhide in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991 to Minahan et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846 to Kaiser.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhide (Japanese Patent No. 63-179537) in view of Minahan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991), and further in view of Kaiser (U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicant has amended claim 19 herein to include the subject matter previously recited in claims 26 and 28 (i.e., prior to the amendments herein) including the limitations of intervening claims, which subject matter has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. Applicant notes that the subject matter of claims 26 and 28 as been set forth alternatively in claim 19 for sake of concise claiming (i.e., securing at least one discrete component to *at least one of* the at least one stack die (claim 26) and the at least one base die (claim 28). Additionally, Applicant notes that independent claim 19 has been amended to remove certain language which the Examiner did not appear to afford any patentable weight (e.g., providing a layer of electrically conductive adhesive and electrically grounding the at least one base die via the layer of electrically conductive epoxy adhesive and the at least one stack die). Applicant submits that claim 19 is, therefore, in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Japanese Patent No. 63-179537 to Yasuhide and U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991 to Minahan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846 to Kaiser, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,323,060 to Fogal et al.

Claims 21 through 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhide (Japanese Patent No. 63-179537) and Minahan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991) in view of Kaiser (U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846), and in further view of Fogal et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,323,060). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Each of claims 21 through 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34 depend, ultimately, from claim 19. As set forth hereinabove, claim 19 has been amended to include subject matter previously indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. Applicant, therefore, submits that claims 21 through 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 21 through 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34.

Obviousness Rejection Based on Japanese Patent No. 63-179537 to Yasuhide and U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991 to Minahan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846 to Kaiser, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,399,898 to Rostoker.

Claims 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhide (Japanese Patent No. 63-179537) and Minahan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,991) in view of Kaiser (U.S. Patent No. 5,281,846), and in further view of Rostoker (U.S. Patent No. 5,399,898). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claim 31 has been cancelled. Each of claims 30 and 31 depend, ultimately, from claim 19. As set forth hereinabove, claim 19 has been amended to include subject matter previously indicated by the Examiner as being allowable. Applicant, therefore, submits that claims 30 and 31 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 30 and 31.

Objections to Claims 26 and 28/Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26 and 28 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form. As noted hereinabove, the subject matter of claims 26 and 28 (including the limitations of intervening claims) has been included in independent claim 19 in alternative form. Applicant submits that claim 19, therefore, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 33 and 34 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 19, 21 through 23 and 25, 27, 29 through 31, 33 and 34 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley B. Jensen
Registration No. 46,801
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 13, 2006.

BBJ/dn:slm

Document in ProLaw